



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 42

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman  
12400 Wilshire Blvd., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

**COPY MAILED**

**MAY 02 2003**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:	
Farber et al.	:	
Application No. 09/612,598	:	ON PETITION
Filed: July 7, 2000	:	
Attorney Docket No. PM 270531	:	

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed April 17, 2003, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner in reply to the non-final Office action mailed March 29, 2002, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 have been obtained. Accordingly, the application became abandoned on June 30, 2002.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." This is **not** final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m); (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required by 37 CFR 1.137(c). Where there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 was unintentional, the Commissioner may require additional information. See MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(C) and (D). The instant petition lack(s) item (1).

As to item (1), The instant petition was accompanied by a request for continued examination (RCE) under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.114. However, the filing of a RCE was improper since prosecution in the application had not closed. Prosecution in an application is closed when an application is under appeal, or the last Office action is a final action, a notice of allowance, or an action that otherwise closes prosecution in the application. Since the non-final Office action of March 29, 2002 did not close prosecution, the filing of an RCE was improper. Accordingly, the RCE filed on April 17, 2003 will not be processed.

In view thereof, the \$750 RCE fee will be refunded to petitioner's deposit account. The response required for a grantable petition to revive in this case must be either an Amendment that places the application in condition for allowance, a Request for Reconsideration, or a Continuing Application. See MPEP section 711.03(c).

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                    Mail Stop Petitions  
                              PO Box 1450  
                              Arlington, VA 22313-1450

By facsimile:            (703) 308-6916  
                              Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand:                   Office of Petitions  
                              2201 South Clark Place  
                              Crystal Plaza 4, Suite 3C23  
                              Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Latrice Bond at (703) 308-6911.



Latrice Bond  
Paralegal Specialist  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy